

# Exhibit U

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

CAROLYN WEIRICK and  
ELVIRA GRACIELA  
ESCUDERO LORA,  
Plaintiffs,

CASE NO.

vs. JCCP 4674/BC656425

BRENNNTAG NORTH  
AMERICA, INC. (Sued  
individually and as  
successor-in-interest  
to MINERAL PIGMENT  
SOLUTIONS, INC. and as  
successor-in-interest  
to WHITTAKER CLARK &  
DANIELS, INC.), et  
al.,

Defendants.

- - -

Deposition of WILLIAM E. LONGO Ph.D.,

Taken by Matthew L. Bush,

Before Jennifer D. Hamon,  
Certified Court Reporter,

At the Offices of Atlanta Reporters,  
Johns Creek, Georgia,

On Wednesday, April 17, 2019,  
Beginning at 11:07 a.m. and ending at 3:28 p.m.

- - -

1 Q And after August 2017, you used  
2 different test methods than you originally did.  
3 I'm talking about ISO-PLM and Blount PLM. Why  
4 did you decide to test under ISO-PLM?

5 A We wanted to see -- because I have  
6 been testifying that the typical R93 or PLM  
7 analysis was not the way to go for these trace  
8 analyses because of sensitivity issues, and we  
9 decided to see if we could enhance the ISO-PLM  
10 analysis and then compare it to a Blount.

11 Where a typical PLM analysis for  
12 asbestos-added products, the analyst may spend 10  
13 minutes on it, 15 minutes because of the  
14 concentrations of asbestos, what we did was take  
15 the optical microscope and change out one of the  
16 objective lenses to what's called an aberration  
17 corrected lenses so you get better resolution.

18 And instead of 15 minutes, our two  
19 analysts, mainly Paul Hess, spends anywhere from  
20 two to six hours on one sample and does it all  
21 under dispersion staining. And then we have a  
22 high-resolution camera attached to the polarized  
23 light microscope and a high-resolution monitor so  
24 that they can view the structure in more detail  
25 to see if there was a way that the PLM analysis

William E. Longo, Ph.D.

Weirick, et al. vs Brenntag North America, et al.

April 17, 2019

1 could be made much more sensitive.

2 And the Blount PLM analysis is a heavy  
3 liquid concentration, and we wanted to compare  
4 the two.

5 Q So you test each MDL model with the  
6 three tests, the ISO-PLM, the Blount PLM, and the  
7 TEM; correct?

8 A Correct.

9 Q Do you have an explanation for why one  
10 test may be positive and some tests will be  
11 nondetect for the same sample?

12 A Because they're really looking at  
13 different things. The TEM analysis, and I've  
14 testified -- and I testified in the Weirick case  
15 is biassed against very large bundles. We've  
16 seen this over and over again over the years in  
17 other unrelated cases, and the PLM analysis is  
18 only finding these very large bundles.

19 The Blount PLM is biassed against low  
20 iron anthophyllite as well as concentrating it,  
21 concentrating the tremolite and actinolite, so  
22 finding positives in the Blount PLM, because  
23 we're looking at a lot more material than TEM.

24 But overall, TEM's still the most  
25 sensitive method, the Blount PLM next, and then

William E. Longo, Ph.D.

Weirick, et al. vs Brenntag North America, et al.

April 17, 2019

1 under any contract that is prohibited by  
2 OCGA 15-14-37(a) and (b) or Article 7.C. of the  
3 Rules and Regulations of the Board; and I am not  
4 disqualified for a relationship of interest under  
5 OCGA 9-11-28(c).

6 There is no contract to provide  
7 reporting services between myself or any person  
8 with whom I have a principal and agency  
9 relationship nor any attorney at law in this  
10 action, party to this action, party having a  
11 financial interest in this action, or agent for  
12 an attorney at law in this action, party to this  
13 action, or party having a financial interest in  
14 this action. Any and all financial arrangements  
15 beyond my usual and customary rates have been  
16 disclosed and offered to all parties.

17 This 19th day of April, 2019.

18  
19   
20 JENNIFER D. HAMON, CCR B-2287  
21 Certified Court Reporter  
22  
23  
24  
25